PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference R 44662	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below		
	International filing date (day/month/year) 04 November 2004 (04.11.2004)	Priority date (day/month/year) 04 November 2003 (04.11.2003)		
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237				
Applicant SZELES, Josef, Constantin				

	====				
1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis. 1(a).				
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.				
	In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.				
3.	. This report contains indications relating to the following items:				
	Box No. I	Basis of the report			
	Box No. II	Priority			
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability			
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention			
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited			
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application			
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application			
4.	The International Bureau will co not, except where the applicant r date (Rule 44bis .2).	mmunicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but nakes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority			
	-				
		Deta of incomes of this manual			

Date of issuance of this report 27 July 2006 (27.07.2006) Authorized officer The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Yolaine Cussac Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70 e-mail: pt11@wipo.int

Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) See form PCT/ISA/210 Date of mailing (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION R 44662 See paragraph 2 below International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 04.11.2003 PCT/AT2004/000390 04.11.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61K31/198, A61P25/00 Applicant SZELES, Josef, Constantin 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP Authorized officer

Telephone No.

Facsimile No.

International application No.

PCT/AT2004/000390

Box	No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	With	h regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was i, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
		, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under
		Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	inve	h regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed intion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	C.	time of filing/furnishing
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Add	itional comments:

International application No.
PCT/AT2004/000390

Box No. I	II Non-establishment of opinion v	vith regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability		
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:				
	the entire international application			
\boxtimes	claims Nos. 6-24 and 26 (IA)			
becaus	se:			
\boxtimes		aid claims Nos. 6-24 and 26 (IA) ch does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):		
	Claims 6-24 and 26 rel	ate to subject matter which, in the opinion		
	of this Authority, fal	ls under PCT Rule 67.1(iv). Consequently,		
	no expert opinion has	been established in respect of the		
	industrial applicabili	ty of the subject matter of said claims		
	(PCT Article 34(4)(a)(i)).		
	the description, claims or drawings (indicare so unclear that no meaningful opinion	ate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. a could be formed (specify):		
	the claims, or said claims Nos.	are so inadequately supported		
	by the description that no meaningful opi	nion could be formed.		
	no international search report has been es	tablished for said claims Nos.		
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequentinstructions in that:	te listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative		
	the written form	has not been furnished		
		does not comply with the standard		
	the computer readable form	has not been furnished		
		does not comply with the standard		
		ar amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the unex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.		
	See Supplemental Box for further details.			

International application No.
PCT/AT2004/000390

Box	No. V			ale 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; oporting such statement	
1.	Statemen				
	Nove	lty (N)	Claims	1-26	YES
			Claims		NO
	Inven	tive step (IS)	Claims		
		• • •		1-26	_ YES
					_ 110
	Indus	trial applicability (IA)		1-5 and 25	_ YES
			Claims		_ NO
2.	Citations	and explanations:			
	Reference is made to the following documents:				
	D1:	EHRENPREIS S	: "D-p	nenylalanine and other enkephalinase	
		inhibitors a	s phar	macological agents: Implications for some	
		important th	erapeu	tic application" ACUPUNCTURE AND ELECTRO-	
		THERAPEUTICS	RESEA	RCH 1982 UNITED KINGDOM, vol. 7, no. 2-3,	
				2, XP009043539	
	D2:			rmacology of enkephalinase inhibitors:	
	Animal and human studies" ACUPUNCTURE AND ELECTRO-THERAPEUTICS				
	RESEARCH 1985 UNITED STATES, vol. 10, no. 3, 1985, pages 203- 208, XP009043546 ISSN: 0360-1293				
	D3:			"A combined treatment with D-amino acids	
	<i>D</i> 3.				
		and electroacupuncture produces a greater analgesia than either treatment alone; naloxone reverses these effects" PAIN			
				vol. 8, no. 2, 1980, pages 231-236,	
		XP002316290	•		
	D4:	DATABASE BIO	SIS [O	nline] BIOSCIENCES INFORMATION SERVICE,	
		PHILADELPHIA	, PA, I	US; 1991, KALYUZHNYI L V ET AL: "THE EFFECT	
		OF AN ENKEPH	ALINAS	E BLOCKER ON ACUPUNCTURE RESULTS IN	
		ACUPUNCTURE-	SENSIT	IVE AND ACUPUNCTURE-RESISTANT RABBITS"	
		XP002316291	Databa	se accession no. PREV199294021147	
	D5:	EP-A-0 004 0	40 (ME	RCK PATENT GESELLSCHAFT MIT BESCHRANKTER	
		HAFTUNG) 19	Septem	per 1979 (1979-09-19)	
				de to the relevant passages only in cases	
			t been	mentioned in the international search	
	report.				

International application No.
PCT/AT2004/000390

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Art. 33(2) The subject matter of claims 1-26 is formally novel and thus satisfies the criteria of PCT Article 33(2).

Combination of the following features, which are mentioned in all independent claims, is not disclosed in the prior art:

- (a) point-stimulation therapy together with
- (b) breakdown of substance inhibiting endogenous opioid neuropeptides, which is
- (c) present or administered in a product intended for intravenous infusion.
- Art. 33(3) The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3) because the subject matter of claims 1-26 appears not to be inventive.

D1 represents the closest prior art. D1 discloses the use of D-phenylalanine as enkephalinase inhibitor for enhancing the effect of the analgesia achieved by electroacupuncture. The problem to be solved can accordingly be defined as follows:

finding of an improved medicament for enhancing the effect of a point-stimulation therapy.

The present application proposes to solve the stated problem by using a substance which inhibits the breakdown of endogenous opioid neuropeptides and which is present and administered in a product intended for intravenous infusion.

D2 discloses the use of D-leucine, which is to be categorized as equivalent to the use of D-phenyl-alanine, for intensifying the analgesic effect of methods for point stimulation (acupuncture).

D3 discloses the efficiency of the combined use of D-phenylalanine and D-leucine for the same purpose. The dosages used correspond to the orders of magnitude proposed in the present application.

D4 emphasizes the analgesic efficiency of the

International application No.
PCT/AT2004/000390

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

combination of D-phenylalanine with the point stimulation - which is also used in the present application - at sensitive points on the ears.

D5 emphasizes the mechanism of the analgesic effect of D-phenylalanine and D-leucine as inhibition of the breakdown of endogenous opioid neuropeptides.

In the light of the prior art teaching, the following is stated:

In relation to the subject matter of claims 1-26, it is pointed out that no basis for acknowledgement of an inventive step is evident in the present application because no evidence is found that the technical features forming the basis for novelty (intravenous infusion) contribute to solving the stated problem in a way which would not have been predictable by a person skilled in the art, since both the basic use of the said substances for enhancing the effect (in particular the analgesia) of methods for point stimulation and the underlying mechanism of the effect were known.

Art. 33(4) The subject matter of claims 1 to 5 and 25 is regarded as industrially applicable within the meaning of PCT Article 33(4).

The PCT Contracting States do not have uniform criteria for assessing the industrial applicability of claims 6-24 and 26 in their present form. Patentability may also depend on the wording of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize the industrial applicability of claims to the medical use of a compound; it may, however, allow claims to the first medical application of a known compound or to the use of such a compound in the manufacture of a drug for a new medical application.